



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,249	10/15/2001	Giorgio Attardo	PHARMA-123	9696
24999	7590	01/28/2004	EXAMINER	
MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, PC 2200 CLARENDON BLVD SUITE 1400 ARLINGTON, VA 22201			MELLER, MICHAEL V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1654	

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/976,249	Applicant(s) ATTARDO ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael V. Meller	Art Unit 1654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-38 and 40-48 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 39, 49-73 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group IV, claim 39 and the species of compound 21 on page 21 of the specification in Paper No. 11 is noted. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the methods of using the compound and the compound will encompass the same search. This is not found persuasive because as stated in the restriction requirement, the compounds can be used in materially distinct process and applicant is reminded of the extensive literature search which is not co-extensive.

The structure of claim 39 is so broad and it encompasses many different compounds. The structure is simply too broad to search. Applicants elected the compound of structure 21 on page 21 of the specification. The core structure of that elected compound was searched and that is what is examined in this application. To include the other structures encompassed by claim 39 is a search which is a serious burden on the examiner.

Applicant argues that the scope of what was to be examined was not clear. It was very clear and a chemical structure was even drawn out for applicant's use. What applicant finds to be not clear is simply not understood. Is applicant suggesting that a chemical structure is not clear? How else could the examiner have made this clearer to applicant? The core structure (on page 3 of the last office action) is what the examination of this application is limited to. The claims have now been amended to

Art Unit: 1654

delete the elected subject matter (the core structure as noted). Applicant is required to reinsert the elected subject matter (the chemical core structure presented in the last office action).

This application contains claims drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse applicant is required to reinsert the elected core structure. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 39, 49-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Belleau et al. '315, EP 337713, WO 9218517, or Chu et al.

The compound of the core structure is anticipated by the references.

Applicant suggests that the examiner didn't point out in the reference where the claimed compound was but since the reference clearly showed chemical structures which read right on the elected core structure, it was apparent which structure the examiner was referring to.

Claims 39, 49-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Belleau et al. '753, Cimpoia et al., or Belleau et al. '753.

The compound of the core structure is anticipated by the references.

Applicant suggests that the examiner didn't point out in the reference where the claimed compound was but since the reference clearly showed chemical structures which read right on the elected core structure, it was apparent which structure the examiner was referring to.

Claims 39, 49-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by WO 00/57861.

The compound of the core structure is anticipated by the reference.

Applicant suggests that the examiner didn't point out in the reference where the claimed compound was but since the reference clearly showed chemical structures which read right on the elected core structure, it was apparent which structure the examiner was referring to.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael V. Meller whose telephone number is 703-308-4230. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday: 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback can be reached on 703-306-3220. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Application/Control Number: 09/976,249
Art Unit: 1654

Page 6

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. V. Meller', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michael V. Meller
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1654

MVM